

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are rejected. Claims 1, 12, and 23 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the Claim amendments. Please cancel Claims 2, 13, and 24 without prejudice. Claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 24-32 remain pending.

Examiner Interview

On Tuesday August 23, 2005 a telephone conference was held with Examiner Steven Rao and Anthony Murabito. In the conference, the Applicants discussed the cited art of Mamiya et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,322), as well as the recited claim limitations of Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 29, and 30. While no agreement was reached during the telephone conference, the Examiner did make claim suggestions for Claims 1, 12, and 23. The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-25, and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mamiya et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,322), hereinafter referred to as "Mamiya," in view of Kubo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,279), hereinafter referred to as "Kubo." The Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in independent Claims 1, 12, and 23

are not taught or suggested by Mamiya alone, or in combination with Kubo. Claim 1 of the present invention recites (emphasis added):

a backlight device;
a reflective display disposed above said backlight device and having at least one opening therethrough;
an embedded light guide extending through said opening of said reflective display and extending beyond a reflective surface of said reflective display wherein said embedded light guide is for conducting light from said backlight device to an area in front of said reflective surface; and
a front light reflecting film disposed in front of said reflective surface of said reflective display and wherein said front light reflecting film is operable to reflect light emitted from said embedded light guide onto said reflective surface and wherein said front light reflecting film is transparent to allow viewing of said reflective display.

Independent Claims 12 and 23 recite similar Claim limitations. The Applicants respectfully submit that Mamiya does not teach or suggest a reflective display having at least one opening therethrough as recited in Claims 1, 12, and 23 of the present invention. The Applicants further submit that Mamiya does not teach or suggest an embedded light guide extending through an opening of a reflective display which extend beyond a reflective surface of the reflective display as recited in Claims 1, 12, and 23 of the present invention. Finally, the Applicants respectfully submit that Mamiya does not teach or suggest a front light reflecting film disposed in front of the reflective surface of the reflective display operable for reflecting light emitted from the embedded light guide onto the reflective surface of the reflective display and which is transparent to allow viewing of the reflective display.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Kubo fails to overcome the shortcomings of Mamiya. Specifically, Kubo does not teach or suggest a reflective display having at least one opening therethrough as recited in Claims 1, 12, and 23 of the present invention. The Applicants further submit that Kubo does not teach or suggest an embedded light guide extending through an opening of a reflective display which extend beyond a reflective surface of the reflective display as recited in Claims 1, 12, and 23 of the present invention. Finally, the Applicants respectfully submit that Kubo does not teach or suggest a front light reflecting film disposed in front of the reflective surface of the reflective display operable for reflecting light emitted from the embedded light guide onto the reflective surface of the reflective display and which is transparent to allow viewing of the reflective display. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 1, 12, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are overcome.

Claims 3 and 5-11 depend from Claim 1 and recite additional limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 3 and 5-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are also overcome.

Claims 14 and 16-22 depend from Claim 12 and recite additional limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants

respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 14 and 16-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are also overcome.

Claims 25 and 27-32 depend from Claim 23 and recite additional limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 25 and 27-32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are also overcome.

Claims 4, 15, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mamiya in view of Kubo and in further view of Hirakata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,191,833) hereinafter referred to as "Hirakata." The Applicants respectfully submit that the recited claim limitations of Claims 4, 15, and 26 are not rendered obvious by Mamiya alone or in combination with Hirakata.

With respect to Claim 4, 15, and 26 the Applicants respectfully submit that Mamiya alone, or in combination with Kubo, does not teach or suggest a backlight device disposed beneath a reflective display, or one or more embedded light guides extending through the reflective display as recited in Claim 1 of the present invention. Moreover, Hirakata does not overcome the shortcomings of Mamiya because Hirakata does not teach or suggest an embedded light guide extending through an opening of a reflective display as recited in Claim 1. Additionally, Hirakata does not

teach or suggest a front light reflecting film disposed in front of the reflective surface of the reflective display operable for reflecting light emitted from the embedded light guide onto the reflective surface of the reflective display and which is transparent to allow viewing of the reflective display. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of Claims 4, 15, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is been overcome.


CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-32 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: Aug. 30, 2005



Anthony C. Murabito
Reg. No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060